

Comment on “Superfluidity in the interior-gap states”

W. Vincent Liu and Frank Wilczek

Center for Theoretical Physics, Department of Physics,
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Recently we analyzed [1] the possibility of a new, hybrid superfluid-normal state of matter, the “interior gap” phase. We studied idealized models that support the existence of this phase, and also proposed that it might eventually be realized in cold atom systems. In a recent paper [2], Wu and Yip presented calculations that they interpreted as indicating an instability of the interior gap phase. Here we observe that their interpretation does not apply to the situations of most physical interest. Their instability was derived under the implicit assumption that one should perturb the relevant systems, which typically contain two distinct species, at fixed values of the separate chemical potentials. However it can be, and generally is, appropriate to enforce different constraints, involving fixed values of particle numbers. Under these conditions one often finds, as indicated for fixed particle numbers in [1] and for different but related conditions in [3, 4], stable states of the kind we claimed.

We will be considering simple models with Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\mathbf{p}, \alpha=L,H} (\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}\alpha} - \mu_{\alpha}) a_{\mathbf{p}\alpha}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{p}\alpha} + \text{interaction} \quad (1)$$

where $\epsilon_{\mathbf{p}\alpha} = \mathbf{p}^2/2m_{\alpha}$ and the index α labels the light (L) and heavy (H) fermions, respectively. For a particle-conserving interaction, such that the theory supports a $U(1) \otimes U(1)$ symmetry transforming the phases of fermion operators $a_{\mathbf{p}L}$ and $a_{\mathbf{p}H}$ separately, the fermion number densities $n_{L,H}$ are independently conserved. The model Hamiltonian considered by Wu and Yip falls into this class, with equality of chemical potentials $\mu_{\alpha} \equiv p_{F\alpha}^2/2m_{\alpha}$ assumed.

To clarify the possibilities, let us distinguish three cases:

a. Both number densities fixed. The normal state can give way to a superfluid state, through a pairing instability. We showed in [1] that once the coupling strength is greater than a critical value (which approaches zero in the limit $m_H \gg m_L$) pairing is favored. When both densities are conserved, however, the density difference $\Delta n = n_H - n_L$ cannot be affected by pairing. Therefore the chemical potentials must be adjusted to accommodate the change of band structure due to pairing, holding particle densities fixed. For example, if $p_F^H > p_F^L$ the new p_F^H must be enlarged to accommodate the particles promoted from the interior. Formally, one finds that a branch of the Bogoliubov excitation spectrum must cross zero energy, and these zero-crossings determine the effective “Fermi” surfaces. Whether the system chooses the BCS or interior gap state is really determined by the initial values of particle densities.

In Ref. [2], Wu and Yip assumed that the Fermi momenta $p_{F\alpha}$ for both heavy and light fermions are unchanged across the phase transition from the normal state to the superfluid state (being either BCS or interior gap) or in the presence of a superflow current. This is an inappropriate assumption for ultracold atoms confined in a trap with negligible particle loss. For example, if they had been fixing both heavy and light particle densities, or the overall particle density (see next paragraph), their expression for the paramagnetic current in linear response (c.f. eq. (12) of Ref. [2]) would employ modified chemical potentials in the presence of superflow current,

$$\frac{1}{m_{\alpha}} \sum_{\mathbf{p}} \mathbf{p} \left[\tilde{\phi}_{\alpha}^2 f(\eta_{\alpha} \tilde{E}_h + \mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w}) - \phi_{\alpha}^2 f(\eta_{\alpha} E_h) \right], \quad (2)$$

with the tilde ‘ $\sim$ ’ indicating the adjusted $\tilde{p}_{F\alpha}$ ’s. The $\tilde{p}_{F\alpha}$ ’s receive corrections in linear order $\sim |\mathbf{w}|$ [4], and so does the paramagnetic current. This is of the same order as, and counters, the linear term arising directly from $\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{w}$.

b. Overall density fixed. If we add a term proportional to

$$a_{\mathbf{p}H}^{\dagger} a_{\mathbf{p}L} + h.c., \quad (3)$$

as for instance to describe Rabi oscillations between different hyperfine spin states of an alkali atom, then the symmetry of the Hamiltonian (1) is reduced to a single $U(1)$, conjugate to the total density n_t . The relative density $\Delta n = n_L - n_H$ is no longer conserved. Again, the interior gap phase can be favorable in weak coupling. A specific proposal is spelled out in [5].

When pairing occurs, the chemical potential $\bar{\mu} = (\mu_L + \mu_H)/2$ must adjust to accommodate the total number density. In a practical experimental arrangement, the relative chemical potential $\Delta\mu \equiv \mu_L - \mu_H$ can be held fixed [5]. Then the thermodynamic variables are $(n_t, \Delta\mu)$. Δp_F , defined as Fermi momentum difference, changes its value in response to pairing when $m_L \neq m_H$, even if $\Delta\mu$ is held fixed.

c. Chemical potentials fixed. If the model system (1) is connected to reservoirs of both light and heavy particles, then the particle numbers of both species are not conserved within the subsystem. We have realized for some time that the interior gap state is very unlikely to occur in the weak coupling regime for this case. A detailed discussion is contained in Ref. [4].

In Ref. [1] our discussion was mainly directed toward cold atom systems with different kinds of atoms, which fall under the first case mentioned above. We also briefly

mentioned the possibility of interior gap state connecting two bands in an electronic solid material. That falls under the second case, since at some level only overall electron number is strictly conserved. The third case, of which Wu and Yip analyzed a special example, did not arise.

We are grateful for discussions with J. Bowers, E. Gubankova, K. Rajagopal, and P. Zoller. This work is supported in part by funds provided by the U.S. Department of Energy (D.O.E.) under cooperative research agreement #DF-FC02-94ER40818.

-
- [1] W. V. Liu and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 047002 (2003).
 - [2] S.T. Wu and S. Yip, Phys. Rev. A (to appear) [arXiv: cond-mat/0303185].
 - [3] I. Shovkovy and M. Huang, arXiv: hep-ph/0302142.
 - [4] E. Gubankova, W. V. Liu, and F. Wilczek, arXiv: hep-ph/0304016.
 - [5] W. V. Liu, F. Wilczek, and P. Zoller (to appear).